



Libby Area Technical Assistance Group, Inc.

PO Box 53, Libby, MT 59923

July 12th, 2005 LATAG Meeting Minutes

(Note: bold items within paragraphs are motions made and voted on as well as action items agreed upon.)

Board Member Attendees:

JoElyn Brus
Eileen Carney
Helen Clarke

Mike Noble
Les Skramstad
LeRoy Thom

Contractor Attendees:

Cheryl Fox

Guest Attendees:

Catherine LeCours
David Spielman
Paul Lammers
Peggy Churchill

Scott Supernaugh
Shawn Oliveira
Tommy Cook

1) Call to Order approximately 7:05pm.

2) Introductions

3) Review and approval of previous meeting minutes:

a) Minutes were reviewed for the June 7th, 2005 LATAG Meeting.

i) **JoElyn Brus made the motion to accept minutes as written, Helen Clarke second the motion. Motion unanimously passed.**

4) Old Business (action items from June 7th, 2005 meeting):

a) It was requested to begin documenting guests on LATAG meeting minutes.	Cheryl Fox	Completed
b) It was requested to begin attaching Action Items on meeting minutes.	Cheryl Fox	Completed
c) Technical Advisor "hold harmless letter"	Mike Noble	Not Needed
d) CRS Committee follow up with the City of Libby	Mike Noble	Due August 8th
e) EPA SQUAPP Documentation to LATAG (this document is to be distributed to EBoard members and any other member wishing a copy (ACTION ITEM)).	Peggy Churchill	Completed
f) EPA response to LATAG's position on crawlspaces	EPA	Pending
g) EPA response to LATAG's position on carpets Les Skramstad stressed the importance of this topic. Peggy Churchill reported that carpets were a part of the Remedial Investigation taking place this summer. This is also addressed in the SQUAPP.	EPA	Pending
h) LATAG Board Member Terms	Cheryl Fox	Due August 9 th
i) Email CRS information to CRS Committee	Gayla Benefield	Completed
j) Owner Accountability form to Donna Kaeding-Tholen	Cheryl Fox	Completed

- 5) Report – Grant Administrator – Cheryl Fox
 - a) Second quarter report 2005 needs to be completed. In-kind matching time sheets need to be submitted for this quarterly report (**ACTION ITEM**).
 - b) The Grant Administrator contract was submitted to EPA. No response was received regarding the contract. (**ACTION ITEM**).
 - c) May/June reimbursement was completed, submitted and received.

- 6) Report – EPA (work in progress):
 - a) Peggy Churchill gave a report on work in progress.
 - i) Approximately 85 houses have been completed and the goal for 2005 is 170 to 200 additional properties.
 - ii) The Stimson property is approximately 70 to 75% completed.
 - iii) Highway 37 is scheduled for clean up this probably be address once as part of the ROD.
 - iv) Wet demolition of the Epperson property has been completed.
 - v) Wet demolition of the Loomis property is scheduled to begin July 13th, 2005.
 - vi) The RI (Remedial Investigation) is one of the “hottest” topics. EPA is working on answering the community’s questions, rounding out the investigation. Enough good data is needed to make final decisions regarding the clean up.
 - vii) EPA has talked about the Troy High School to be done “sometime” before the end of the season (before school starts). Internal administrative EPA issues need to be resolved regarding this project.
 - viii) EPA is planning on doing a light technical session in September. This will be a summary of the Denver Technical session is scheduled for Libby. It is anticipated to be held over a two-day period. The first day is scheduled for Superfund Process Training in relation to the order of how the process is followed and what it means to the public. The second day is scheduled as a mini version of what was done in Denver. EPA needs input from LATAG as to what was most valuable from the Denver training to make the best way to use this time (**ACTION ITEM**).
 - (1) It is anticipated to be held either at the Ponderosa Room in City Hall or at the VFW to accommodate as many people as possible.
 - b) Shawn Oliveira gave a report on the demolition of the Epperson property.
 - i) The demolitions went well although better air results are needed with tighter controls. With the completion of this property, a better process will be a result for the next (Loomis) property. A good plan of approach is in place for the next property.
 - ii) One dust cloud at the beginning of this demolition was experienced. When the front awning came done there was a dust cloud seen. From that one particular cloud there was some hits on the dust parameters. The wind for most of the day was N-NE, but in the morning the wind was W-SW and that was where structures were seen on the inter ring monitoring.
 - iii) A site map was available on the air parameter monitors with a table of Epperson Demolition Air Results (DRAFT). They were installed with inter, mid and outer ring parameters.
 - iv) The reason the demolition was done was due to the condition of the building. Demolition was done under an exemption of AHEARA processes because the building was unsound. The demolition was an experiment under a wet demolition scenario. The demolition began on June 22nd and was completed approximately June 24th. See attached DRAFT air sample results.
 - (1) The second page indicates inter-ring parameter monitors. These were analyzed by CDM with their on-site lab. These were used to evaluate daily engineering controls. These were analyzed using their normal sampling protocols on the project. This is with a sensitivity of .005 structures per cc.

- (2) The middle and outer-ring parameters monitors were all sent off-site for analysis. This is with a sensitivity of .0001 structures per cc. This is a very aggressive sensitivity and typically very costly. Off-site analysis was necessary to keep their on-site lab capacity at a level needed. Daily monitoring of samples was completed.
 - (3) The first page of the air sample results indicates a top table showing four areas of inter-ring monitoring. The second table shows mid and outer-ring monitoring. On the tables, indicators for the middle ring also indicate the height of the air sample. For example on the Map ID, a location of M-1-6 indicates the middle ring, position one, and height of six feet. The second page of the air sample results indicates the location of each parameter-monitoring device.
 - (4) Settled dust samples were also taken at each one of these sample locations.
 - (5) Structures were seen during the demolition, not a lot, but some were there. The numbers seen were all lower than what would be normally clear an attic with in one of the houses. Even when structures were seen, they were very low, and the reason why they were seen was due to being analyzed at such a low level of detection. This has not been done before on a project.
 - (6) Typically a N-NE wind direction was experienced and that is how samples were sent out to the lab (focused on the wind pattern). All parameter-monitoring rings will be received over time.
 - (7) The second day results were very good, there were very few structures seen. Quite a few non-detects were recorded on the second day, and the third day was even better.
 - (8) After the demolition CDM worked with the contractors on how to improve the process. One of the things discussed was pre-demolition. It was discussed on how to get the building wet before demolition began. One recommendation was to install some low-flow hoses in the attic 24 hours before the demolition began. Another recommendation was to have a water piercing applicator. This is a one-inch diameter iron pipe and inject water behind wall cavities and areas in the attic what wouldn't normally be accessible (this is not a high-pressure water application). A new excavator will be used on the next property that has a rotating clam bucket that should improve precision in bringing the building down.
 - (a) This building has a lot of plaster and concrete and the goal is to keep the dust down as much as possible. Equipment is scheduled providing for a "man-lift" for water suppression during the demolition to provide a misting situation constantly. They will be much more proactive on the next project.
 - (9) It was discussed that only properties that are structurally unsound, or properties that the contamination cannot be removed without putting workers at risk will be considered for demolition. If a building is safe to be cleaned it will be cleaned and the decision of demolition will be left up to the owner.
- v) A more focused discussion can be available at the next LATAG meeting regarding what these air samples mean (**ACTION ITEM**).
- (1) CDM has been getting back about two air sample results back a day. For the .0001 samples it takes one analyst at a TEM microscope eight hours to complete one sample.

7) Sub-Committee Reports

- a) Technical Advisor Committee - _____ (chairperson)
 - i) Weekly meeting are being held at noon on Tuesdays. The next scheduled meeting is for July 19th. It is anticipated that a chairperson will be chosen at the next meeting (**ACTION ITEM**).
 - ii) A call has been made to Danette regarding the posting process of the position. No response has been received yet.
 - iii) Several resumes have been received.
- b) Nominating Committee – LeRoy Thom (chairperson)
 - i) No report available.
- c) Communications Committee – Jan Meadows (chairperson)
 - i) No report available.
- d) CRS (Community Resource Specialist) Committee – Mike Noble (chairperson)
 - i) A proposal will be presented to the City of Libby at the next available City Council meeting.
- e) Health and Safety Committee – Abe Troyer (chairperson)
 - i) No report available, but this committee needs to be reactivated. Next month this will be reactivated.

8) Special Presentation:

- a) Catherine LeCours discussed the Community Involvement Plan for Troy. She made available to LATAG EPA's Community Involvement Plan, Troy Operable Unit, Libby Asbestos Site document. This document to be distributed to the EBoard of LATAG and any other member who wish a copy (**ACTION ITEM**). Attention was given to Appendix B – Interview Questions.
- b) Troy wishes the clean up of Troy to be "quiet, quick and completed quickly."

9) Review and agreement on action items generated from this meeting

10) Open Discussion:

11) Next Meeting Scheduled – August 9th, 2005.

12) Adjourn:

- a) **Les Skramstad made the motion to adjourn the meeting, JoElyn Brus second the motion. Motion unanimously passed. Meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:35pm.**